

Applicant : Schmitt et al.
Serial No. : 10/695,635
Filed : October 28, 2003
Page : 10 of 11

Attorney's Docket No.: 13913-159001 / 2003P00566
US

REMARKS

Claims 1-22 and 27-30 were pending as of the action mailed 9 April 2007.

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 20, 27, 28 and 30 are being amended, claims 2, 22 and 29 have been cancelled and no claims have been newly added. No new matter has been added. Support for the amendments to claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 20, 27, 28 and 30 may be found within the applicant's specification at least at page 4, lines 2-5, 13-14 and 23-30.

Reexamination and reconsideration of the action are requested in light of the forgoing amendments and the following remarks.

Interview Summary

The applicant thanks Examiner Ingberg for granting a telephone interview on 13 June 2007. The time spent with the applicant's representatives Hans Troesch and Arriènne Lezak was greatly appreciated. During the interview, the claim language was discussed in light of the prior art. Recommendations were made by the examiner for overcoming the prior art, which recommendations have been incorporated into the claims as noted above.

Information Disclosure Statement

The applicant appreciates the examiner's consideration of the Information Disclosure Statement filed on 21 July 2006.

Section 101 Rejections

The examiner rejected claims 20-22 and 27-30 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. To expedite prosecution, and without prejudice, claims 20 and 27 have been amended to overcome the rejections. Claims 21, 22 and 28-30 respectively depend from claims 20 and 27.

Withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101 is therefore respectfully requested.

Section 103 Rejections

Claims 1-22 and 27-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,854,932 (“Mariani”) in view of “Principles of Object-Oriented Analysis and Design”, by James Martin (“Martin”).

Claims 1, 20 and 27

To expedite prosecution and without narrowing the scope of the claims, claims 1, 20 and 27 have been amended to better clarify the different levels of usage of an interface where each level is treated as an individual interface with its own dependency list.

For the foregoing reason, claims 1, 20 and 27 should be allowed.

Remaining Claims

The remaining claims depend from or correspond to independent claims 1, 20 and 27, and are allowable for at least those reasons that apply to those independent claims.

Conclusion

By responding in the foregoing remarks only to particular positions taken by the examiner, the applicant does not acquiesce with other positions that have not been explicitly addressed. In addition, the applicant’s selecting some particular arguments for the patentability of a claim should not be understood as implying that no other reasons for the patentability of that claim exist. Finally, the applicant’s decision to amend or cancel any claim should not be understood as implying that the applicant agrees with any positions taken by the examiner with respect to that claim or other claims.

Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 21 June 2007

/Arriènne Lezak/
Arriènne Lezak
Reg. No. 51,943

Customer No. 32864

Telephone: (650) 839-5070
Facsimile: (650) 839-5071